
Review Process

[about](#) | [editors](#) | [registration](#) | [submissions](#) | review process | [copyright](#) | [FAQs](#)

Enculturation is a blind peer-reviewed journal. Once a submission has been posted in our conference queue, it is assigned to two editorial board members who review the submissions based on the following format:

General Evaluation (select appropriate numbers):

___1. The submission is significant and sound, falls within the scope of Enculturation, and should be published with only minor revisions.

___2. The submission is basically significant and sound but requires rewriting to make it a solid publishable contribution.

___3. The submission requires major rewriting and it should be revised and resubmitted for review.

___4. The submission is sound but does not fall within the scope of Enculturation and should not be included.

___5. The submission does not exhibit a broad enough understanding of the field and does not warrant further consideration by Enculturation.

Comments to the Editor(s):

Include comments to the editors that will not be passed on to the authors.

Comments to the Author:

Include elaborations on selections from 1-5 above and note specific places for revision, suggestions for cutting, or other issues with the text.

Each submission receives two blind reviews from different board members, who then submit their responses to the editors. Once these reviews have been examined, the editors select the pieces they feel warrant inclusion in Enculturation, inform the authors of their decisions (providing the author with copies of each blind review), and then assign each accepted author to a specific board member (who also receives the blind reviews). The authors are asked to make any needed revisions and their work is passed on to the assigned board member to re-review. Once the board member is confident about the revisions, s/he submits the piece to the editor(s) to be included in the issue.